


PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor:	James D. Webb	Confirmation No.	1416
Serial No.:	10/821,499		
Filed:	April 09, 2004	Customer No.:	27581
Examiner:	Dilek B. Cobanoglu		
Group Art Unit:	3626		
Docket No.:	P0011232.00/1111-067US01		
Title:	DATA EXCHANGE WEB SERVICES FOR MEDICAL DEVICE SYSTEMS		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the United States Patent and Trademark Office electronic filing system on August 16, 2010.

By:



Name: Renee L. Whittaker

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an Appeal from the final Office Action mailed on February 1, 2010, which finally rejected claims 1 and 4-20, and the Advisory Action mailed on May 13, 2010 maintaining the rejection of the claims. The Notice of Appeal was filed on June 14, 2010 with a Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review. The Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review was mailed July 8, 2010. The period for filing this Brief runs through August 16, 2010 (August 14, 2010 falls on a Saturday).

Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-1778 in the amount of \$540.00 to cover the required fee for filing this Appeal Brief for a large entity. Please charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1778.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Real Party in Interest.....	3
Related Appeals and Interferences.....	3
Status of Claims	3
Status of Amendments	3
Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter.....	3
Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed on Appeal	6
Argument	7
Conclusion	13
Appendix A: Claims on Appeal	14
Appendix B: Evidence	19
Appendix C: Related Proceedings	20

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The Real Party of Interest is Medtronic, Inc. of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences for the above-referenced patent application.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 and 4-20 are pending and are the subject of this Appeal. The claims on appeal are set forth in Appendix A.

Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,385,589 to Nelson et al. (hereinafter “Nelson”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0046239 by Stawikowski et al. (hereinafter “Stawikowski”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,589 to Trusheim et al. (hereinafter “Trusheim”).

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Stawikowski and Trusheim and further in view of Official Notice.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were filed subsequent to the final Office Action dated February 1, 2010.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

All pending claims relate generally to data exchange systems for use with medical device systems wherein web services are implemented to facilitate data exchange functions.¹ One of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats², wherein translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application³, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format.⁴

¹ Appellant's specification, e.g., at paragraph [0006].

² *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0008], [0047]-[0050], [0054], [0065], [0072], [0078], and [0080] and Table II.

³ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0008], [0047], [0048], [0065], [0078] and Table II.

⁴ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0048] and [0065] and Table II.

Independent claim 1 recites a system for exchanging medical data, the data exchange system comprising means for acquiring medical data⁵, means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed, or displayed⁶, one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange function between the means for acquiring medical data and the means for handling medical data⁷, wherein one of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats⁸, wherein translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application⁹, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format.¹⁰

The function performed by the means for acquiring medical data is acquiring medical data. The structure described in the specification as corresponding to the function of acquiring medical data is a medical device, such as an implantable medical device or an external medical device.¹¹

The function performed by the means for handling medical data is handling medical data, such as storing, analyzing or displaying medical data. The structure described in the specification as corresponding to the function of handling medical data is a data handling system, which may include a host server for a centralized database and/or one or more third party or clinical data storage systems.¹²

Independent claim 19 recites a system for exchanging medical data, the data exchange system comprising a first means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed or displayed and wherein first medical data handling means is provided with a communication connection¹³, a second means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed, or displayed and wherein second medical data handling means is

⁵ Appellant's specification, e.g., at paragraphs [0030] and [0034].

⁶ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0026], [0027], [0037], [0038], and [0044].

⁷ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0006]-[0009], [0026], [0027], [0038], [0042], [0044], [0045], [0067], [0068], [0075], and [0081].

⁸ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0008], [0047]-[0050], [0054], [0065], [0072], [0078], and [0080] and Table II.

⁹ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0008], [0047], [0048], [0065], [0078] and Table II.

¹⁰ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0048] and [0065] and Table II.

¹¹ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0030] and [0034].

¹² *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0026], [0027], [0037], [0038], and [0044].

¹³ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0026], [0027], [0034], [0037]-[0041], and [0043]-[0045].

provided with a communication connection¹⁴, one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange function between the first and second data handling means via a communication connection¹⁵, wherein one of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats¹⁶, wherein translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application¹⁷, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format.¹⁸

The function performed by the first means for handling medical data is handling medical data, such as storing, analyzing or displaying medical data. The structure described in the specification as corresponding to the function of handling medical data is a data handling system, which may include a host server for a centralized database and/or one or more third party or clinical data storage systems.¹⁹

The function performed by the second means for handling medical data is handling medical data, such as storing, analyzing or displaying medical data. The structure described in the specification as corresponding to the function of handling medical data is a data handling system, which may include a host server for a centralized database and/or one or more third party or clinical data storage systems.²⁰

Independent claim 20 recites a system for exchanging data between a medical device and a remote data handling system, the data exchange system comprising the medical device, wherein the medical device is configured to store medical data and transfer the data via a communication connection²¹, means for electronically storing data in the remote data handling system and for receiving data from the medical device via the communication connection²², one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange

¹⁴ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0026], [0027], [0034], [0037]-[0041], and [0043]-[0045].

¹⁵ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0006]-[0009], [0026], [0027], [0037], [0040], [0041], and [0043].

¹⁶ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0008], [0047]-[0050], [0054], [0065], [0072], [0078], and [0080] and Table II.

¹⁷ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0008], [0047], [0048], [0065], [0078] and Table II.

¹⁸ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0048] and [0065] and Table II.

¹⁹ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0026], [0027], [0037], [0038], and [0044].

²⁰ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0026], [0027], [0037], [0038], and [0044].

²¹ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0034], [0035], and [0037].

²² *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0037], [0039], [0044], [0059]-[0063] and Table I.

function²³, wherein one of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats²⁴, wherein translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application²⁵, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format²⁶, and wherein the web service may be invoked by an application running on the medical device or on the remote data handling system to allow data to be exchanged between the medical device and the remote data handling system.²⁷

The functions performed by the means for electronically storing data in the remote data handling system and for receiving data from the medical device via the communication connection are electronically storing data in the remote data handling system and receiving data from the medical device via the communication connection. The structures described in the specification as corresponding to the functions of electronically storing data in the remote data handling system and receiving data from the medical device via the communication connection are data exchange web services, such as a storage web service.²⁸

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Appellant submits the following grounds of rejection to be reviewed on Appeal:

1. The rejection of claims 1, 4-14, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Stawikowski and further in view of Trusheim.
2. The rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Stawikowski and Trusheim and further in view of Official Notice.

²³ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0006]-[0009], [0026], [0027], [0037], [0040], [0041], and [0043].

²⁴ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0008], [0047]-[0050], [0054], [0065], [0072], [0078], and [0080] and Table II.

²⁵ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0008], [0047], [0048], [0065], [0078] and Table II.

²⁶ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0048] and [0065] and Table II.

²⁷ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0027], and [0036]-[0043].

²⁸ *Id.*, e.g., at paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0037], [0039], [0044], [0059]-[0063] and Table I.

ARGUMENT

Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the current rejections advanced by the Examiner by the Board of Patent Appeals based on the arguments below.

1. Rejection of Claims 1, 4-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nelson in view of Stawikowski and further in view of Trusheim

The Final Office Action rejected claims 1, 4-14, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Nelson in view of Stawikowski and further in view of Trusheim. Appellant submits that this rejection is in error and should be reversed. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Appellant's claims 1, 4-14, and 16-20.

Claims 1, 4-14 and 16-18

Independent claim 1 recites a system for exchanging medical data. The data exchange system comprises means for acquiring medical data, means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed, or displayed, and one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange function between the means for acquiring medical data and the means for handling medical data. One of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats. The translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format.

The Examiner's rejection of claim 1 as allegedly being obviousness fails to account for each and every element of claim 1. As one example, none of the references cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests "a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format, and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats." The Examiner correctly noted that Nelson does not teach the translation service required by Appellant's claim 1, but cited Trusheim to overcome this deficiency of Nelson. However, Trusheim fails to teach or suggest "a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format, and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats," as required by Appellant's claim 1.

Trusheim describes a medical data system that can be used for practicing preventative medicine.²⁹ The system of Trusheim includes a translator 31 that receives source data files 30, which are stored in a variety of legacy systems in a variety of legacy formats.³⁰ The translator 31 is used to translate the source data files 30 into a single common format.³¹ For example, the translator 31 includes a translation program that receives a data file having a first format and translates the data file into an output file having a second, standard format.³² The translation program utilizes data maps to translate data files from a variety of first formats to the single second format.³³ As described by Trusheim, the primary function of the translator is to provide mapping of source data files (comprised of a variety of legacy data having different formats) to standard data elements and code value names, e.g., of the single standard format.³⁴

Trusheim does not teach or suggest “a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format, and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats.” In fact, the Examiner appears to have conceded this point. Rather than argue that Trusheim teaches this requirement of claim 1, the Examiner asserted that “Trusheim teaches translating the data from one format to another, therefore it teaches a structure necessary to configure the data in a plurality of formats.”³⁵

The Examiner’s assertion that Trusheim teaches a structure necessary to configure the data in a plurality of formats is incorrect. Trusheim relies on a series of unidirectional maps to convert data stored in a variety of legacy formats into a single, common format. Trusheim makes clear that the output format is a standard format. For example, as described above Trusheim states that the “primary function of translator 31 is to provide mapping of source data files to standard data elements and code value names.” Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, the translator 31 of Trusheim could not be used to convert source data in a variety of different formats, e.g., due to the Trusheim translator only having unidirectional maps with a single output format. Trusheim does not teach or suggest returning data in a plurality of output formats, and the Trusheim translator is incapable of doing so.

²⁹ Trusheim, col. 1, lines 6-15.

³⁰ *Id.* at col. 8, lines 5-9.

³¹ *Id.*

³² *Id.* at col. 8, lines 9-15.

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ *Id.* at col. 8, lines 15-30.

³⁵ *E.g.*, Office Action dated July 6, 2009.

As another example, none of the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a “translation web service...configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format.”

As described above, the Examiner appears to have conceded that Trusheim does not teach receiving a request for one of a plurality of formats, and returning medical data in the requested output format, as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Rather, the Examiner’s argument is that the hardware of Trusheim *could be* used to perform this function. Despite the ability of Trusheim to convert one data format into another, it does not *necessarily* follow that the hardware of Trusheim is capable of receiving a request for one of a plurality of formats, and returning data in the requested output format.

As shown in Fig. 3 of Trusheim, the translator 31 is connected only to source data files 30 and a bus adapter program 35a. There is no apparatus present for receiving a desired format input. It is an oversimplification to assert that the hardware for data conversion to a single format can necessarily be used for receiving a request for one of a plurality of formats, and returning data in the requested output format.

Trusheim fails to teach or suggest receiving “translation web service...configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application,” and returning the medical data “in the requested output format,” as required by claim 1. Trusheim is limited to outputting data in a single format, without the ability to receive a request for an output format that is one of a plurality of output formats. Likewise, Nelson and Stawikowski also fail to disclose these requirements of Appellant’s claim 1. Consequently, Nelson in view of Stawikowski and Trusheim fails to teach, suggest, or disclose the translation web service required by claim 1.

The Examiner’s position is that, despite the failure of Trusheim to teach “a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format, and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats,” or a “translation web service...configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format,” it still would have been obvious based on Trusheim to further modify the combination of Nelson and Stawkowski to include these

features. This position is untenable. Absent any teaching of these features in the prior art, there is no apparent reason one of ordinary skill in the art to have included them in a combination of Nelson and Stawkowski.

Furthermore, Trusheim is not related to a translation *web service* that performs a data exchange function between two means, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner incorrectly asserted that the web server 50 of Trusheim being in communication with the translator 31 somehow supports the assertion that Trusheim includes a translation web service. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the translation services provided by the translator 31 of Trusheim are performed wholly within the translator 31.³⁶ As described above, the translator 31 simply converts input data into a common output format. The fact that the translator 31 may have some attenuated connection to a web server does not transform the translator 31 into a translation web service.

Trusheim is also not at all related to a translation web service that performs a data exchange function between two means as required by Appellant's claim 1, and the translator 31 of Trusheim is not a web service. Moreover, none of the applied references include any teaching for modifying translator 31 of Trusheim to make it a web service. For example, Trusheim includes no teaching as to how to modify its teachings to comply with receiving any other sort of input data, e.g. medical data from a means for acquiring medical data or a means for handling medical data as required by Appellant's claim 1. Neither Nelson nor Stawkowski reveal how one could modify the teachings of Trusheim to arrive at the web service of Appellant's claim 1.

In sum, even if one of ordinary skill in the art had found a reason to combine the applied references, one would not have arrived at the requirements of Appellant's claim 1 from their combination.

Dependent claims 4-14 and 16-18 are allowable for at least the reasons put forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend.

Claim 19

Claim 19 recites requirements similar to those of independent claim 1. For example, independent claim 19 requires a system for exchanging medical data. The data exchange system comprises a first means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed or displayed and wherein first medical data handling means is provided with a communication

³⁶ See *Trusheim*, Fig. 3.

connection, a second means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed, or displayed and wherein second medical data handling means is provided with a communication connection, and one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange function between the first and second data handling means via a communication connection. One of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats. The translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format.

For at least the reasons described with respect to independent claim 1, the applied references also fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Appellant's independent claim 19.

Claim 20

Claim 20 recites requirements similar to those of independent claim 1. For example, independent claim 20 requires a system for exchanging data between a medical device and a remote data handling system. The data exchange system comprising the medical device, wherein the medical device is configured to store medical data and transfer the data via a communication connection, means for electronically storing data in the remote data handling system and for receiving data from the medical device via the communication connection, and one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange function. One of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats. The translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format. The web service may be invoked by an application running on the medical device or on the remote data handling system to allow data to be exchanged between the medical device and the remote data handling system.

For at least the reasons described with respect to independent claim 1, the applied references also fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Appellant's independent claim 20.

2. Rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nelson in view of Stawikowski and Trusheim and further in view of Official Notice

The Office Action rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nelson in view of Stawikowski and Trusheim and further in view of Official Notice. Appellant submits that this rejection is in error and should be reversed.

Claim 15 requires that the multifunction web service is an enrollment web service for registering a patient or medical device record newly enrolled in a first data storage system into a second data storage system. The Examiner inappropriately relied on Official Notice, rather than provide a reference evidencing knowledge of this requirement in the prior art, despite Appellant's repeated requests for a reference demonstrating that it is well known to register a patient and/or medical device in a web service. The Examiner also failed to provide an objective reason for further modification of the cited references in view allegedly well-known teaching in the prior art. In fact, in the Final Office Action dated February 2, 2010, the Examiner attempted to shift the burden to the Appellant to separately argue the patentability of the claim without the Examiner first providing an anticipatory reference.

Official Notice without documentary evidence to support an Examiner's conclusion is permissible only in some circumstances.³⁷ While "Official Notice" may be relied on, these circumstances should be rare when an application is under final rejection or action under 37 CFR 1.113.³⁸ It is not appropriate for the Examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known.³⁹ For example, assertions of technical facts in the areas of esoteric technology or specific knowledge of the prior art must always be supported by citation to some reference work recognized as standard in the pertinent art.⁴⁰

³⁷ See MPEP 2144.03.

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ See *In re Ahlert*, 165 USPQ 418, 420-421 (CCPA 1970).


⁴⁰ *Id.*

The Examiner has failed to cite a reference demonstrating that it was, at the time the application was filed, well known to register a patient and/or medical device in a web service. This supposed prior art teaching is clearly not the sort that is capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. Furthermore, the Examiner has failed to provide an objective reason for further modification of the cited references in view supposedly well known teaching. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case of obviousness of claim 15.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 1 and 4-20. In view of Appellant's arguments, the final rejection of Appellant's claims is improper and should be reversed. Reversal of all pending rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested. Appellant respectfully requests separate review by the Board for each of the grounds of rejection addressed above under separate headings.

Date: August 16, 2010
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.286.8350
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By: 
Name: Jason D. Kelly
Reg. No.: 54,213

APPENDIX A
THE CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. A system for exchanging medical data, the data exchange system comprising:

means for acquiring medical data;

means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed, or displayed;

one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange function between the means for acquiring medical data and the means for handling medical data,

wherein one of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats,

wherein translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format.
4. The system of claim 1 wherein the plurality of web services further includes an analysis web service.
5. The system of claim 4 wherein the analysis web service includes an analysis method for performing a requested data analysis function on the specified data and returning the analysis results to an invoking application.

6. The system of claim 1 wherein the plurality of web services further includes a storage web service.
7. The system of claim 6 wherein the storage web service includes a method for writing data to a data storage system.
8. The system of claim 6 wherein the storage web service includes a method for retrieving data from a data storage system.
9. The system of claims 7 or 8, wherein the data storage system is any of a relational database system; a file system; an XML file system, or a medical device.
10. The system of claim 1 wherein the plurality of web services further includes a multifunction web service.
11. The system of claim 10 wherein the multifunction web service invokes any of a translation web service, an analysis web service, and a storage web service.
12. The system of claim 11 wherein the multifunction web service is a data log service for informing a first data storage system of a new data set entered into a second data storage system.
13. The system of claim 12 wherein a new data set comprises a record of a monitoring session performed by a medical device.

14. The system of claim 11 wherein the multifunction web service is a session retrieval service for retrieving monitoring session data recorded by a medical device and stored in a data storage system.

15. The system of claim 11 wherein the multifunction web service is an enrollment web service for registering a patient or medical device record newly enrolled in a first data storage system into a second data storage system.

16. The system of claim 1 wherein the means for acquiring medical data is an external medical device having telemetric communication with an implantable medical device for receiving data from the implantable medical device and storing the data.

17. The system of claim 1 wherein the means for acquiring medical data is an external monitoring or therapy delivery device capable of acquiring and storing medical data.

18. The system of claim 1 wherein the means for acquiring medical data is an implantable medical device.

19. A system for exchanging medical data, the data exchange system comprising:

a first means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed or displayed and wherein first medical data handling means is provided with a communication connection;

a second means for handling medical data wherein medical data may be stored, analyzed, or displayed and wherein second medical data handling means is provided with a communication connection;

one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange function between the first and second data handling means via a communication connection,

wherein one of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats,

wherein translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format.

20. A system for exchanging data between a medical device and a remote data handling system, the data exchange system comprising:

the medical device, wherein the medical device is configured to store medical data and transfer the data via a communication connection;

means for electronically storing data in the remote data handling system and for receiving data from the medical device via the communication connection;

one or more devices configured to provide a plurality of web services for performing a data exchange function,

wherein one of the web services is a translation web service having an input method configured to receive medical data in a first format and an output method configured to return the medical data in a plurality of output formats,

wherein translation web service is further configured to receive a request for one of the plurality of output formats from an invoking application, and the output method is configured to return the medical data to the invoking application in the requested output format, and

wherein the web service may be invoked by an application running on the medical device or on the remote data handling system to allow data to be exchanged between the medical device and the remote data handling system.

APPENDIX B

EVIDENCE

NONE

APPENDIX C
RELATED PROCEEDINGS

NONE